



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

made use of the Solymán-Perseda episode for the body of his story. His deviations from this source have flowed from natural conditions, chiefly the desire to observe the requirements of the classic drama and to make out of his tragic original a comedy rather than a tragedy. Any apparent agreement with the Scudéry-group is only accidental. The question as to which one of the Yver-group, whether Yver or Wotton or Kyd or Mainfray, was used by Davenant is left open and most probably will always remain so.

KILLIS CAMPBELL.

Johns Hopkins University.

GERMAN LANGUAGE.

German Orthography and Phonology. A Treatise with a Word-List. By GEORGE HEMPL, Ph. D., Professor of English Philology and General Linguistics in the University of Michigan. Part i. The Treatise. Boston, U.S.A., and London: Ginn & Co., 1897. 12mo, pp. xxxii, 264.

PROFESSOR HEMPL'S treatise on *German Orthography and Phonology* deserves the highest praise for its scholarly thoroughness and accuracy. Not satisfied with giving a simple compilation of what others had done before him, the author has embodied in his book the results of much original work, and it will consequently claim the attention of students of German not only in this country, but also in the Fatherland.

For the second time within less than two years, Germany has had to thank American scholarship for a generous contribution toward the understanding of German speech and thought. Beside the present work I have, of course, in mind Professor Francke's admirable *Social Forces in German Literature*, of which I am reminded also by another consideration. The two books mark—it seems to me—an epoch in the study of German in this country: in each case an interesting struggle has been fought between the publisher and the author, and the author has carried the day. Originally, it was the publisher's desire to issue an inexpensive elementary school book, but in the hands of the author the book grew to be an independent work of original value. It is a good sign that the publishers should in each case have been willing to print a book which was not intended to be of immediate use in

the class room. Let us hope that the buyers of such advanced works will prove numerous enough to encourage the publishers in their generous efforts.

Professor Hempl's book "aims to be a systematic and practical treatise on the subjects pertaining to the writing, printing and uttering of Modern German." (I should have preferred: "to the printing, spelling and uttering," etc.)

Of the four books which it is to contain the first three (Orthography, Phonology, Accent) have appeared, while the fourth one, a Word-List together with a complete Index, is to form the Second Part, which we hope will soon appear.

The chapters of the First Book, five in number, treat of the Alphabet, Spelling, Division of Words, Use of Capitals and Punctuation respectively; of these the chapter on the Alphabet in which Mr. Hempl sketches the development of the forms of German letters does not quite satisfy me. Why should we not be given the forms of *all* the letters of the early alphabets? Or—if space were lacking—why should anything be presented save the Roman, Schwabach and Fraktur alphabets? Furthermore, in the second chapter, we miss a systematic treatment of the varieties of spelling, interesting as are the twenty selections in § 30.

As to the German script, given on p. 12, the second forms of *M* and *N*, given in the list, I have seen only in letters of business men who, as is generally known, use a strange mixture of German and Roman script.

The Second Book, on Phonology, contains three chapters. In the first is given, in the narrow compass of less than thirty pages, an admirable abstract on Phonetics; then follows the chapter on German Speech-Sounds; the last chapter, treating of Pronunciation, is the most interesting of this Book. The author here takes up the questions of a Standard of Pronunciation, of Stage Pronunciation, of the Best German. To characterize his attitude, I quote from the Preface, pp. xiv sq.:

"I am not the advocate of the unique value of the German pronunciation of any one province. I have aimed to enable the learner to choose in each particular that usage that is most general—which not only will offend the fewest ears, but which also stands the best chance of ultimately prevailing. Such a 'Durchschnitts deutsch' is most likely to find actual realization in the capital of the nation, especially if that

capital like London and Berlin, stands on the border of the Midland and that part of the country that has chief political and literary importance."

The last sentence is 'Zukunftsmusik' and needs no discussion, but the same thought is expressed in a slightly different form in § 163, and it is against this modification that I wish to say a few words. Professor Hempl writes (p. 112):

"The speech of the upper classes in Berlin has much higher claim [namely, than Hanoverian German] to being 'the best German' for it agrees in most points with what is the more usual throughout the country; and if Berlin remains the capital of the Empire, it must ultimately have an importance and influence similar to that long exerted by the speech of London and Paris."

Of course, Mr. Hempl has a right to express some doubt as to whether Berlin is likely to remain the capital of the Empire, and it is not on that ground that I take exception to the above passage, although I cannot suppress a sad smile when I meet with such a suggestion in this place. "Es thut mir weh, dass ich dich in *der* Gesellschaft seh." Speaking seriously, however, it seems to me that there might have been mentioned a number of cities and towns in the Midland, that have the same claim as Berlin to represent 'the best German,' and where the mixture of dialectic shades in the speech of the upper classes is less confusing than in Berlin. And further, I might ask: Is there really such a strong analogy between the position of London and Paris on one side and Berlin on the other? What the author says himself, § 158, about the spread of education and the ever growing democratic tendencies, certainly does not strengthen his position.

After some very valuable paragraphs on the difference between German and English pronunciation—in which I miss only the warning against the use of the *th*-sound in German—we find more than forty pages devoted to the Values of the Letters. Professor Hempl presents the pronunciation of the various letters in their usual alphabetical order, with numerous—shall I say, numberless?—references to the preceding sections in which the general subject and the governing principles have been treated systematically. For each letter, there is first given a general statement as to its value in the 'Durchschnittsdeutsch,' and then we have an almost confusing wealth of informa-

tion poured out in the notes which treat of special modifications of the general rules. The sections on *A* and those on *G* show perhaps better than any others what an amazing amount of painstaking labor has been put into this work.

Before turning to the last Book of the First Part I wish to remark upon a number of details: p. 56, § 65, note, it ought to have been stated that in spite of the spellers, *Vossische Zeitung* is still the only form in which the name of that newspaper appears.—p. 96, § 141, *Rüster* is wrongly given as local, while according to p. 155, § 237, note 2, *ü* is as frequent as *u* in this word (Sanders has only *Rüster*).—p. 109, note: 'That Schiller should be responsible for *Stralsund*' seems somewhat doubtful. I, for one, must confess that I did *not* remember the stress of the word in Schiller. And the young Germans in general learn the name of the Pomeranian town in their geography and again in their history lessons long before they read *Wallenstein*. The stress is explained differently and according to more general principles p. 242, § 331, 2 (b).—p. 113, § 165 2 (b): Has German really no such low vowels as those in *hat*, *law*? The author states himself (p. 116) that *a* tends to become a front vowel resembling *a* in *hat*, for example in Hanover, and a vowel resembling *a* in *law* is heard in Silesian and also in South German and Austrian dialects.—p. 117, § 170, note 3: The pronunciation *Fükk'er* is not the only one in use. I am familiar only with *Fü'ker*, which, if I mistake not, is also the pronunciation current in Austria; the word is unusual in North Germany. Professor Hempl has Sanders' authority on his side, but Flügel-Schmidt-Tanger has both forms giving the one with stressed *i* first; Sachs-Villatte also has both forms but in the reversed order.—p. 117, *ibid.*: Against *Käkerläh* (so also Sanders) I wish to state that I only know the form with two *a*'s, which form is also given by Flügel, while Sachs has *Käkerläh*.—p. 118, § 173, remark 2: Neither of the pronunciations given for *Nikolaus* appears to be correct, pronounce *Ni'kolaus*, cf. Flügel and Sachs, or *Nikolaus*? I know only a form with *ɪ* which must be quite frequent, cf. *en*-dearing form *Nickel* in Hessen and *Nickelsgraben* for *Nicolaigraben* in Lusatia.—p. 126, § 185, note 6, *Bēthlehem* seems to be the literary form. The common form is *Bē'thlehem*,

cf. Flügel and Sachs. *Jetzt gehen wir nach Bethlehem* (=zu Betf) certainly never has *z̄*.—p. 124, § 182, remark: The statement might have been added that there exists a dialectic *z̄ks̄en* (=sechzehn) due to *sechs*. I have heard it in the pronunciation of people from Mecklenburg and from the Lower Rhine.—p. 141, § 209, note 1 (a): *Ungarn* may be pronounced in two ways, either with the *ng* of *singer*, or with that of *finger*; cf. also Vietor, *Phonetik*, p. 249, where the second form is mentioned as frequent, which implies that he considers the first form as the more common.—p. 142, § 210, note 3: *Zoologie* has only two narrow *ö*'s; cf. also Vietor, p. 78. The first *o* is long.—p. 145, § 216, note 1: The author advises those who cannot pronounce *ö* properly, to use *ē*, as p. 155, § 237, note 1, he suggests the use of *ī* for *ü* in the same emergency. "All Germans," he adds, "would understand this and many use it." Yes, to be sure, but if ever that *real standard* of which Prof. Hempl speaks on pp. 109 f. has been emphatic in debarring provincial forms it has been so in regard to *ö* and *ü*. The "proper" pronunciation of *ö* and *ü* being a test for *good* German, it seems preferable to use any English sound rather than *e* or *i*. *Gurby* with *ur* as in English *fur* for *Goethe* will not grate upon the ears of educated Germans as much as would *Gête*.—p. 145, § 217, note 2: *Comptoir* has two pronunciations: *Komtor* and *Kontor* (cf. Sachs; and Flügel, where the French pronunciation is also given), the latter being originally the pronunciation of *Kontor* only, which Italian form is older in Germany than French *Comptoir*; cf. Kluge, *Etym. Wb.*,—p. 151, § 229, remark 1: *bisschen* is pronounced *b̄s̄chen* only in North-West Germany, if I mistake not, and is considered dialectic, but not vulgar.—p. 155, § 237, note 2: I doubt whether *ü* in *Nüster*, *-wüchsig*, *wüchse*, *wüsche* has become quite rare. To me only *ü* is familiar, just as *ü* in *Wuchs*, *wuchs*, *wusch*, but the author might refer me to what he has said in § 137, note 3 about, East-Middle Germany. Vietor, p. 66, however, gives *ü* for *Wuchs*, *wuchs* as frequent and *ü* as common before *ch* where the unmodified forms have *ü*; Flügel has *Nüster*, for *Wuchs*, *wuchs* he gives *ü* or *ū*, for *wusch* *ü* also *ū*, and Sachs agrees with him, except for *wüsch*, where he does not have the *ü* form at all.—*Ützen* and *Üchtritz* I know only with *ü*.—p. 157, § 241: It ought to have been stated that in the Latin schools *y* is

taught with the *u* value; cf. the interesting form *lynchen* with *ü* which Professor Hempl mentions himself. *Cyklus* with *ü* seems an artificial form to use, but Vietor, Sachs and Flügel are against me, Sanders, however, has *ü*.—p. 160: The first line of *Faust* in the phonetic transcription representing the careful enunciation of the stage ought to be read as Minor, *Nhd. Metrik*, p. 24, directs; namely, with no stress on *nun* and a strong stress on *ach*. In the second line, *Juristerei* has no stress on the first, but one on the second syllable; cf. Sachs.

The Third Book, on Accent, contains a greater number of independent observations than the others, especially in regard to Sentence-Stress, where Professor Hempl found but little systematic work done. After a few words about the nature of Accent in general and short but valuable remarks on Pitch, he takes up the subject of Stress in the third chapter where he treats the five factors which form the basis of stress-placing: 1. tradition; 2. state of mind of the speaker; 3. his consideration for the mind of the listener; 4. analogy; 5. rhythm and other physical factors. The fourth chapter is given to Sentence-Stress which in modern German, especially in the North, shows a *crescendo* tendency, while the word-stress is *decreasing*. The general principle is stated first; namely, "the psychological predicate is heavily stressed." Then the modifiers of verbs, of nouns and adverbs, as well as the group of anæmic words are discussed in detail. Lastly Transference of Stress in repeated sentences and also Displacement of Stress are taken up, the main difference being that in transference the stress falls on a word which one desires to emphasize, while this is not the case in displacement. Of especially valuable passages in this excellent chapter I mention § 282 (3), where one striking difference of sentence-stress between English and German is stated, the source of constantly recurring mistakes in the German of English-speaking people; and §§ 289 f. treating of the modifier preceding its noun. Here we get a happy explanation of the strange case that even when the modifier has become a full predicate the usual accentuation of modifier and modified word sometimes prevails; the fact being attributed to the concurrence of two influences, analogy and economy of force.

For the last chapter, on Word-Stress, the

author found a good deal of work done as far as simple words and compounds were concerned, while he had to make many contributions of his own in the paragraphs treating of conglomerates. The emphasis, from the very beginning, is laid on the fact that a word does not stand by itself but forms part of a sentence and that therefore, the relation of a word to other words must not be ignored. Regarding compounds Professor Hempl again proceeds from the general principle, which is that "compound nouns have the chief stress on the first member, while compound verbs have it on the second;" a long number of exceptions, among them the lawless crowd of adjectives and adverbs with *un-*, are then explained by the following influences: (a) change in the value of words and parts of words; (b) mental association, that is analogy and contrast, and (c) rhythm.

A special subchapter is devoted to Geographical Names. The conglomerates, which generally keep the old sentence-stress, are treated in three groups: nouns and verbs, pronouns, and particles; an enormous amount of work is compressed here into a few pages. With some general statements about secondary and weak stress the chapter closes.

I shall only add a few remarks in regard to minor points.—p. 217, § 310 (3): Two Latinized forms of *Kleinod* are given, but I think only one is used at present, namely, *Kleino'dien* (cf. Sanders, Flügel and Sachs) despite the statement in Grimm's *Wb.*—p. 225: Under *-or Tenor* (from the Latin) ought to have been given, as p. 226 *Tenor'* is mentioned.—p. 229, § 318, note 1: *zu missverstehn* ought to have the second place being the rarest form.—p. 238, § 330, note: *Monats-, Tages-a'bschluss* or *-schluss'* show a stress quite unfamiliar to me.—p. 240: Minor's authority for *Wilden-bruch'* ought not to be accepted.—p. 245, § 335: *Thaler* ought not to have been translated by 'dollars'.—p. 247, § 341: Against the statement that *hinüber-, herübersetzen* are more common than *ü'bersetzen*, I wish to put the assertion that in spoken language, *ü'bersetzen* is more common as far as my experience goes.—p. 258, § 360, 6: *gleichwohl* has stress on second syllable (cf. Flügel) also *gleichviel*; *wiederum* has usually the stress on the first syllable, cf. Vietor, p. 69. Sanders has *o'bgleich, we'ngleich*.—p. 263, § 366, note 2: Sanders and Sachs give *Elekt'ricität'* which is the only form I know.

The explanation for the tendency to shift the secondary stress to the second syllable if that is a heavy syllable—if such a tendency does exist—seems to lie in the fact that the adjectives are much more common and so *authen'tisch*; *ela'stisch*, *elek'trisch* have influenced the rarer nouns.

Before I close my remarks about this book, which Professor Vietor calls "die beste deutsche Phonetik, im Sinne des Titels," I wish to express my appreciation of its fine typographical garb, which reflects great credit on the publishers. Only the row of strung-up fowl, vaguely resembling the Brandenburg eagle, does not seem appropriate in a treatise on language; it ought to be reserved for heraldic books.

M. F. BLAU.

Bryn Mawr College.

SHAKESPEARE.

The Diary of Master William Silence, a Study of Shakespeare and of Elizabethan Sport, by the Right Hon. D. H. MADDEN, Vice-Chancellor of the University of Dublin: Longmanns, Green & Co., 1898.

THIS book is the outgrowth of a scholarly love of Shakespeare and an appreciation of the pleasures of deer-hunting as carried on in the Forest of Exmoor in accordance with ancient usage. The Vice-Chancellor first collected numerous passages from the plays which are illustrated by hunting customs. Then it occurred to him to put together some of this knowledge in the form of a description of a hunt. The hounds must, of course, belong to *Shallow*; and who was so well fitted to write the diary as *Master William Silence*? One must not be hypercritical. If *Silence* did not write the diary, it is what he might have written; and if the family of *Shallow* is not in Camden's *Britannia*, it might have been, "the blood and quality of *Shallow* are widely diffused through the three kingdoms." Why insist upon facts when fiction is nearer the truth? Why limit one's belief to the uninteresting things that can be proved?

The people come together for the hunting in the park of *Justice Shallow*. This hunt is in honor of the home-coming of the *Lady Katherine*, bride of *Master Petre*, "a man of note in these parts," who has been masquerading as one *Petruchio*. In the diary there are